

To: pstif@sprintmail.com[pstif@sprintmail.com]
From: Tippet Mosby, Leanne
Sent: Fri 6/4/2010 8:23:00 PM
Subject: RE: Scope of Services v. 3

Carol,

I will give you a call in a little bit as I am putting out a fire at the moment. Just a quick note, however, to let you know I was not trying to indicate that PSTIF has any management issues -- I apologize if I didn't make that clear. My primary goal for a more comprehensive review is that there are obvious areas of disagreement between the department and PSTIF. I was hoping this would be a way we could help resolve those and in turn, that could feed in to the RBCA rules issues we need to resolve. Let's talk more . . . but I just wanted to clear that up.

Leanne

From: PSTIF [mailto:pstif@sprintmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 04, 2010 1:22 PM
To: Tippet Mosby, Leanne
Subject: RE: Scope of Services v. 3
Importance: High

Thanks, Leanne. I have done a *very* quick and cursory review, focusing only on the items you inserted and the comments; see attached.

If you have time, please call me this afternoon. There seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding between us on what the purpose of the project is.

I am not aware of any problems involving "process" or "management" or "work flow" in my office. Neither you nor anyone else has brought any such problems to my attention nor has anyone given me any examples of poor communications, or inefficient work, or unproductive activities, or inconsistent decision-making, or slow response by the PSTIF. On the other hand, I have given you multiple examples of these types of problems in the Tanks Section.

Therefore, it was my understanding that the Department is hiring a management consultant to help you identify and fix problems in the Tanks Section. While it will be important for the consultant to understand what the PSTIF is and how our work is affected by and affects DNR's work, and while I would certainly listen to any observations or suggestions the consultant might wish to offer regarding improvements in how we do our job, that is not the purpose of the project

as I understand it.

There is another factor in play that relates to this – We are in the process of rebidding our TPA contract. Whether Williams & Company is the successful bidder or we hire a different firm, it is likely that – as a result of the contract bid process – there will be some changes in some of our internal procedures. Those changes will occur outside the scope of this management analysis being conducted for the Department.

I don't mean to sound rude or critical in this email... Am simply trying to communicate my thoughts as clearly as possible. Again, if you have time, please call me. I much prefer person-to-person conversation over email dialogue.

Thanks,

Carol

From: Tippet Mosby, Leanne [mailto:Leanne.TippetMosby@dnr.mo.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 04, 2010 12:39 PM
To: PSTIF Office
Subject: Scope of Services v. 3

Hi Carol,

Betsy let me know you called. I'm supposed to be off work today, but have been trying to tie up loose ends before I leave. This is one of the things I had been working on this morning, along with several budget issues we are dealing with that I am sure you can relate to.

After careful consideration and discussions with staff, I am offering this counter to the last revision you made to the document.

I worked from the last version you sent to me and used track changes so you can see where I made changes.

- First, I would like to thank you for adding in the last part with the Timing and Payment, that was very helpful!
- Second, for the parts that were specifically about PSTIF, I accepted the changes you provided -- thanks again!

In addition, I added back in some of the items you had taken out, which again, you should be able to easily see due to the tracked changes. Overall, you will see the substantive items I have added back in have to do with the scope of the review. Given the fact that the Department's tanks efforts and PSTIF are inextricably linked, I feel it will be much more helpful to have a more comprehensive review. Along those lines, you will note I added PSTIF's process back in to the mix.

While a process review of the Department's Tanks-related efforts could be beneficial, I was hoping to get more out of this effort. My goal for this process would be that it help to lead us down the path toward resolving our differences on the Tanks RBCA issues. To me, they seem inseparable really. Although I'm rather new to all of this, what I have picked up on is the fundamental differences between the Department and PSTIF are when is something considered "cleaned up," when are we "done" at a site, and what is appropriate in terms of long term stewardship for the sites where contamination is left in place. Although a process review expert is not going to be able to answer these questions from a technical perspective, such an objective view may at least send us in a direction of resolving some of the impasses we seemed to have reached by offering recommendations for a process to lead us through the disagreements.

I noticed you removed the 2004 MRBCA Guideline and Flow Chart. I added that back in, but with the caveat that the consultant would not be expected to read it in its entirety, but it would rather serve as a reference.

I will be out of the office most of next week -- out of pocket (hopefully floating down a river somewhere) on Monday and Tuesday. I will be in St. Louis at a conference on Wednesday and Thursday -- so I will be reachable.

Look forward to hearing from you, and sorry it has taken me some time. As you might expect, we have been quite busy with budget-related discussions given the failure of our water fees. However, this is a very important issue too, and I hope to get it underway soon.

Thanks,

Leanne